

# New York Tribune

First to Last—The Truth: News—Editorial Commentaries  
Member of the Audit Bureau of Circulations

TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 14, 1920.

Owned and published daily by The Tribune Publishing Company, 100 N. York St., New York City. Editor: Walter Dill Scott. Managing Editor: Walter Dill Scott. Business Manager: Walter Dill Scott. Treasurer: Walter Dill Scott. Circulation Manager: Walter Dill Scott. Advertising Manager: Walter Dill Scott. Telephone: Beckman 3000.

**SUBSCRIPTION RATES:** By mail, including postage, in advance. **UNITED STATES:** One Year, \$10.00; Six Months, \$6.00; Three Months, \$3.50. **FOREIGN:** One Year, \$15.00; Six Months, \$9.00; Three Months, \$5.00. **Single Copies:** 10 Cents. **Foreign Rates:** One Year, \$15.00; Six Months, \$9.00; Three Months, \$5.00. **Advertising:** See separate page.

Printed at the Postoffice at New York as Second Class Matter.

**GUARANTY**  
You can purchase merchandise advertised in THE TRIBUNE with absolute safety. If it is defective, the results in any case THE TRIBUNE guarantees to refund your money. No need to return the goods. We make good promptly if the advertiser does not.

**MEMBER OF THE ASSOCIATED PRESS**  
The Associated Press is authorized to use the name of this newspaper in its publications. It is not to be used in any other way. The Associated Press is not responsible for the content of any publication using its name.

## Maine

Have you heard the news from the Pine Tree State?

How Maine went  
Hell bent  
For Governor Kent,  
And Tippecanoe  
And Tyler, too?

This is not a Hard Cider or Log Cabin year, and yet a plurality estimated at more than 60,000 sets a new high-water mark. The Maine Republicans are tired of counting the votes of the avalanche. Their wildest expectations have been more than realized.

The November result is fore-shadowed. A fitting rebuke is administered to the campaigners who began with a specious attempt to deceive the people concerning a moral issue, and have practically ended in a lame effort to win by slander. Will Governor Cox have the effrontery to say that the electorate of Maine has been "bought"?

## "Pay-When-It-Suits-You"

Mayor Hylan has started an agitation for the partial repeal of the pay-as-you-go law. He cites the request for \$46,000,000 for new school buildings as an argument for the modification. He would borrow the money on long-term bonds instead of carrying it as a budget item. He is naturally for anything that will shunt burdens to his successors.

The exemption of appropriations for schoolhouses from the operation of the pay-as-you-go act would, of course, be an opening wedge. Presently the city government would be running to Albany for relief whenever it wanted to make a big expenditure for non-productive purposes and feared the political effect of an immediate enlargement of the budget. Mr. Hylan favors going back to the old pay-when-it-suits-you method of issuing long-term bonds, spending the proceeds and letting some one else wrestle with the problem of refunding or liquidating the principal.

The pay-as-you-go law represented a courageous effort to reform the city's finances. The old system was shiftless—and unduly expensive. It also impaired the city's credit. The Mitchell administration restored confidence and stabilized borrowing transactions by discarding long-time bookkeeping. It also entered into agreements having the nature of a contract with the city's creditors that it would not indulge in further non-productive expenditure which couldn't be met by taxation.

That was a sound exercise of self-restraint. The budget makers are now trying to wriggle away from wisely fixed limitations. New schools may be needed much more than Mayor Hylan's new court-house is needed. "But it would be disastrous in the long run to start in to boost the city debt. It is more necessary now than ever for the city to conserve its borrowing power and live within its means."

## The Judicial Primary

Last year Justice Newburger, turned down for renomination by Tammany Hall, was reflected in the 1st Judicial District, ordinarily strongly Democratic, by a plurality of 81,295. The voters rose to the opportunity of rebuking Boss Murphy's attempt to shelve a judge with a good record in order to utilize a Supreme Court judgeship as a piece of Tammany patronage.

Politicians forget quickly. In the 2d Judicial District the Livingston organization is trying to do exactly what Mr. Murphy did, only it is seeking to deny renominations to three justices instead of one. Justices Aspinall, Jaycox and Clark, Republicans, and Townsend Scudder, Democrat, are up for reelection. Their records entitle them to a continuance in office. They have the endorsement of the Brooklyn Bar Association. But Mr. Livingston is supporting only one of the sitting judges, Mr. Jaycox. The Democratic machine, with similar narrow-mindedness, is supporting only one, Mr. Scudder. A non-partisan league is working to renominate all four of the present justices on both the Republican and Democratic tickets. To do this would be an exhibition of good politics and good citizenship.

In the 1st Judicial District the

Republican and Democratic organizations have endorsed for renomination Justices Guy, Giegerich, Platzeck, Erlanger and Ford. The first four have been approved by the Bar Association. Nine justices are to be elected. The additional four candidates supported by the Republican organization are James O'Malley, Isidor Wasservogel, Henry K. Davis and Robert McMarshall. The additional four Democratic candidates backed by the Democratic organization are William P. Burr and Edward J. McGoldrick, now sitting by appointment; District Attorney Swann and Francis Martin. Messrs. Burr and McGoldrick, like Mr. Ford, lack the recommendation of the Bar Association.

On the primary ballot to be voted to-day the position of the names is determined by lot. Republican voters will be interested to know that second, third and fourth on their list are three anti-organization judicial candidates, Messrs. Wechsler, Schector and Clevenger. Fortunately in the 1st District there is no crude issue this year like the Newburger one of 1919 or the Livingston-McCooney one across the East River.

## Get the Habit!

Whatever party you belong to get out to-day and vote in the primaries. The exciting contests are few, but get the primary habit. Next to the organized nation, a party is the biggest thing in our political life. In many respects it is our principal governing agency, and its business should always be a matter of intimate concern.

In the big cities has been developed a popular indifference to party management which gives the boss and machine their business. This form of sleeping sickness has become chronic and it will take a long time to shake it off. The direct primary is the antidote. Until it is the practice of citizens no more to miss the polls on Primary Day than on Election Day, there will be little enduring political health. Get the primary habit!

## Condonation of Crime

The Socialist organization devoted yesterday, the second anniversary of his conviction for resistance to conscription, to agitation for the release of Eugene V. Debs. Incidentally, what is called "amnesty" is asked for other prisoners whose offenses are styled "political."

The spirit of this propaganda is suggested by the contents of the appeal of The Call, the Socialist organ, for public support. It speaks of the "war-mad" jury which convicted Debs, who acknowledged his guilt. It refers to him as a victim of the "class war."

No pardon is sought on the ground of mercy or repentance. It is held that Debs was right and the jury wrong. If set free it is not denied that he will continue his attacks on organized society and the orderly rule of the majority. No one of a proper mind and heart takes delight in confining men in penitentiaries. But when the matter is put as Debs and his friends put it, what must be the reply? Is each person to judge for himself what laws he is to obey? If he violates laws that the public, through a free majority, has enacted, is his offense merely "political"?

Debs claims to be a Socialist. But in fact his conduct has been profoundly anti-social. He would enjoy the blessings of free society, but would not obey its fundamental rule. Is this not more truly criminal and dangerous to the safety of all than the crime of a thief whose offense would be chiefly against an individual?

Debs does not come before the public with his soul purged, and under the circumstances his release would encourage all forms of law-breaking.

A side light on the lack of good faith of this "amnesty" agitation was furnished not long ago by John Spargo. Mr. Spargo as a Socialist had been requested to join in efforts to get the so-called "political" prisoners released. He replied that he thought it desirable to have associated with the effort men and women of unimpeachable loyalty. He received the following reply: "It is very likely that if your method should be followed the amnesty would be granted at once. But in that case the whole propaganda value of these persecutions would be lost to us. We do not want the President to proclaim a general amnesty nor to pardon any of the prisoners unless it is plainly done because of the menace of our movement. We want agitation far more than we want amnesty."

## Take Jonesco's Warning

The conclusion of the "Little Entente" by Czecho-Slovakia, Rumania and Jugo-Slavia was a measure of realpolitik in the best sense of that much-abused term—a policy founded on realities correctly gauged. It was a wholesome reminder that the disposition recently shown by France to use the military power of Hungary against Soviet Russia contains the germ of very substantial dangers. The statesmen of the succession states know the mind of the present rulers of Hungary. They know that Hungary cannot send a single division to Poland's aid, and

that she would not if she could; they know that Horthy dreams of restoring not only historic Hungary, but the Austro-Hungarian Empire under Magyar domination; they are aware that the Magyars are planning a campaign of aggression against the weakest of their neighbors, German Austria, as the first item in their program of reconquest.

The Rumanian attitude is summarized in a statement of the Foreign Minister, Take Jonesco, published in the Paris Excelsior. Declaring that Rumania would not consider proposals to cede Rumanian territory to Hungary, Mr. Jonesco voiced the sentiment of his nation in terms conspicuous by their firmness. "The thing that is most troubling the European political situation at present," he said, "is that there is a tendency to forget the origins of the war. . . . I do not ask that we should go on making war forever, after having signed peace, but I have not the least desire to play the part of a dupe."

That is blunt speech. It comes from a man whose loyalty to the Allies was fully tested and who at the same time is one of the most consistent workers for peace and reconstruction in southeast Europe.

Under his guidance Rumania has shown a spirit of reconciliation toward Bulgaria; he has repeatedly indicated that the Rumanian government is not averse to friendly agreement with a democratic and regenerate Hungary. Way back in the '90s Jonesco sponsored a Balkan federation as the best guarantee of peace in southeastern Europe. He worked for that idea in 1911-12; he works for it to-day.

The "Little Entente" may be the nucleus of this federation of southeastern Europe. That is its deeper significance. But as far as the exigencies of the moment are concerned, the agreement of the three Danubian powers serves chiefly as a danger signal intended to avert consequences that French-Hungarian alliance would imply.

## On Running Away

There may be a few staid partisans of things as they are who have never longed to run away. But these gluttons for virtue are surely peculiar and far between. The general run of boy-kind and girl-kind—and man-kind and woman-kind—have had their moments when nothing seemed worth a hoot except going away from here and starting life afresh in a world where it is at least occasionally sunny and every-body is always appreciated at his or her true worth—or at any rate appreciation is not in the hands of stubborn, ill-natured dubs, etc.

To all such brothers and sisters of Huck Finn the tale of Miss Louisa Fletcher, of Gloucester, comes with a lyrical lilt and a twang of the heart. Some of the paraphernalia is new; but the essentials of the plot are as old as the fairy tales. There is always a wicked governess, or a witch, or somebody peevish and horribly cruel, who ripens the heart of the runaway to the exploding point. Later, in retrospect, it is possible to see that this individual guilt was exaggerated; it was not really the witch that soured the universe, but the universe that went bad of its own innate meanness and hit upon the witch as its personification. Husbands, and even wives, take on this witch-like aspect in times of stress and strain, we have heard it rumored. But at the time such fine distinctions lie in the gutter. All that matters is that imposing meanness and nagging and restraint loom up in a dark figure behind, and ahead lies the broad, open road to freedom!

Or at least it seems freedom at the time. Miss Fletcher's troubled parent in Indianapolis remarked sagely when the first tidings reached him that "it seemed a case of spanking." Parents may differ in their methods and technique. But fate does not. Therein lies the weakness, we regret to say, of the whole philosophy of running away. Briefly, it might be summed up by the short statement that it can't be done. The open road is there. Parents may be eluded. It is physically possible to run away. But what does one not take with one, however complete the getaway! Not only one's self—which is enough—but all the bonds of affection and interest that make life as much worth while as it can be in whatever spot we land. Perhaps there ought to be such a thing as a fresh start in this blundering run world, but there isn't. All history, from Adam to Huck Finn and Miss Louisa Fletcher, is in agreement upon this depressing truth.

## Italy's Experiment

The exact meaning of the action at the joint convention of socialist and radical laborite organizations of Italy is obscure. But it is to be gathered that while unwilling at this time to swallow Leninism at one gulp the convention shuts no door to it. Instead of an attempt to overthrow the capitalist system at once, the Italian radicals, as a matter of tactics, declare for a sapping siege. Russia, it is practically admitted, has made a failure of the former method, and instead of Bolshevism all at once it is to be introduced by degrees.

The one program almost as much

as the other challenges the present industrial order—promises an end of private ownership and management as the most just and effective method of securing that intensification of production which is essential if standards of living are to be raised and that distribution which gives to workers, through wages, an equitable share of a production progressively enhanced.

The much discussed capitalist system, of course, cannot hope to survive unless on the whole it is best for the masses. Having successfully endured the comparison of Russia, its supporters will not have much doubt of a similar success when comparison is made with the Italian plan of Bolshevism by inches.

In the large (there are, of course, many individual exceptions) the capitalist owner of the industrial century has more than paid for what he got; that is to say, performing the rôle of risk-carrier, improver of methods and coordinator, leader and technician, as well as toll taker, the masses are better off than they would be if cooperative ownership and management were normal and normal workers absorbed the totality of the industrial product.

No intelligent advocate of the capitalist system has ever denied that if the greatest good of the greatest number can be more effectively secured by another method capitalism must and ought to go. If capital is not a profitable servant, worth more than its keep, then it has no justification. It is confessedly based on an unpleasing selfishness, and the only adequate defense of it is that it so harnesses selfishness as to make it labor for the general good.

If a serious effort is made in Italy to place management of great plants in the hands of committees chosen by the present wage workers the experiment, it is needless to say, will be watched with great interest. Will Italy produce as much a man as formerly? This is the test. If she does not, this, of course, means fewer comforts and luxuries for workers and likewise no creation of a fund to make the improvements which a progressive society imperatively demands.

It does not require much prophetic power to be able to predict that to the degree Bolshevism controls Italian industry to that degree Italian wage workers will have slenderer rations and incomes of less exchangeable power.

## That Slush Fund

Democratic Headlines and the Facts in Evidence

To the Editor of The Tribune.  
Sir: On the first page, first column, of the Brooklyn Eagle of Sunday, September 12, 1920, and also continued on the fourth page, last column, are the following headlines: "Cox Charges Are Justified; G. O. P. Slush Fund Proved." The substance of the article indicates that these headlines are intended to mislead and deceive the majority who read only the headlines and will not take the trouble to read further on the subject.

The article in The Eagle referred to reads as follows (I quote verbatim): "The investigation has disclosed, not to the satisfaction of the Democrats, that the \$1,000 limit has been adhered to. It has not shown the hand of Wall Street in furnishing any large amount of funds. Of the first million and a quarter raised only about one-third came from the East. There has been no evidence to show that any money was to be used for 'buying an underhold on the Presidency,' or for establishing 'the use of bayonets in settling labor disputes.' There has been nothing indicating corrupt use of money or any kind of criminality."

These statements in Sunday's Eagle are under the caption: "Cox Charges Are Justified; G. O. P. Slush Fund Proved." The article headlines and gives the lie to the headlines.

These tactics can only be characterized as an adroit attempt to help the Democratic party by misleading the great mass of ignorant voters who read nothing but the headlines in the daily press, yet assume to know all the facts.

Has The Eagle any explanation to offer of these discrepancies? Is any explanation possible of such outrageous distortion of truth?

IDA E. GEDNEY.

Brooklyn, Sept. 12, 1920.

## Cyclone Cox

To the Editor of The Tribune.  
Sir: In looking up the biographies of the Coxes and the Coxes of Ohio it appears that "Sunset Cox" was applied to Samuel Sullivan Cox, an American politician and diplomat, so called from an extremely rhetorical description of a sunset May 19, 1853, in The Statesman, Columbus, Ohio, of which he was the editor.

It does not appear that the candidate is a descendant, as "Sunset" was a Chesterfield by comparison with the present issue, who is degrading the contest for the Presidency to the level of an aldermanic campaign, seeking ambush behind the "sick man at Washington" that he may avoid discussion of the duties of an executive. Cyclonic in nature, no one can know its beginning or its ending, and built upon the proportions of the Mississippi steamboat described by Abraham Lincoln, "which had such a large whistle and small boiler that every time the whistle blew the engine stopped."

His partner, with like tactics, when in Maine, got astray for the moment from his usual vocabulary and truthfully said: "Most men and women will vote this autumn with the realization that the question at issue is the governing of the United States during the coming four years." V. D. MARK.  
New York, Sept. 10, 1920.

## The Conning Tower

### OUTMODED

I saw upon Fifth Avenue  
A flapper wondrously arrayed,  
But all forlorn and weeping, too,  
And thus accosted I this maid:

"Tis not my custom, fairest ladies,  
To speak to maids unknown to me;  
But tell me why you weep like this  
Upon the street so bitterly.

"It's most unseemly for to cry;  
You'll ruin your rouge—you've ruined it now.  
I pray you, maiden, dry your eye—  
What is the matter, anyhow?"

"Oh, tell me, sir, how to get back  
Unto the place where I belong;  
For I have lost my way, alack!"  
(This was the burden of her song.)

(Her broken English is a thing  
In rhyme I cannot reproduce,  
So literally I'm translating—  
A foreign accent is the deuce!)

"My home is in a magazine,  
La Vie Parisienne by name,  
And all the girls that I have seen  
Make me to blush for very shame.

"Such a display of silken hose!  
Pray, let us haste away from here—  
I'd never dare to wear such clothes!  
Oh, take me quickly home, monsieur."

La Vie Parisienne I knew;  
I took her there without delay;  
No more upon the Avenue  
Will this outmoded maiden stray.

C. W. W.

It is a distinction to have been the first person to use the subway telephone. At the instant of half-volleying to press we don't know who has it. We wonder, also, what other fame the man who bought the first subway ticket, back in 1904, has acquired. And how about the man who bought the first admission to the World Series in 1911? Evidences, indeed, as has been said, is fame.

Mrs. Chaplin's complaint, among others, is that Charlie never did anything except think. But probably it was what he thought about her that she really objected to.

### Another Trunk Mystery

(From The Boston Globe)  
LOST—Suitcase (full) at South station waiting room, Plymouth street, on the Boston to Provincetown train; inside was M. Whitehead, E. Syracuse, N. Y.; July 27, Sat. p. m.; reward, R. IVESTER, 49 Conwell ave., W. Somerville, Mass.

Qualities the ideal husband should have are required by N 163, who advertises in The Plainfield Courier-News: "Wanted—To play a trunk; must be strong and reasonable."

Attention of Mr. Julian Street: And his envelopes may be addressed For Mr. H. Pell Brown. . . . Mr. Brown's wife, presumably, addresses her letters Local, or Town.

### Chase vs. Quarry

"Is the chase more thrilling than the quarry?" you ask.  
Well, I'll just say, my quarry:  
I've been chasing your column for seventeen years.  
And there ain't no gosh darned quarry. Twit.

"The Wilson tour," The Tribune's Marion, O., correspondent says, "was ideally planned to cover the West in the shortest possible time. That is the only reason that may prompt Senator Harding to lay out a similar route for him." It is not to be thought, we deduce, that the Senator, by speaking in the same towns that were in the President's tour, is conceding one centimeter to the Democratic party.

### The Uses of Advertisement

Sir: I note that Miss Noyes McMein now employs a clipping bureau. Some time ago I published in your col. the statement that I had found it safe to use the Authors' Clipping Bureau, Munsey Bldg., Washington, D. C., as they had not discovered the col. This proved an error. They had. There is now no haven. It seems only fair, in view of my previous statement, that Miss McMein, and others, should be made acquainted with the facts.

SAMUEL MERWIN.

Perhaps the new administration will not be so great a change. The first two paragraphs of Senator Harding's Minneapolis speech, O. D. F. points out, contained seven "very's."

An ideal contributor is she who, for a clipping of her contribution, asked for a week after its publication, sends us, by trusted messenger, One Quart.

### To Sport Editor, Statepost:

Sir: In the current number of Brother Lorimer's revered bicentennial hebdomad Mr. V. H. Cornell reveals certain curious and hitherto unpublished facts regarding the rules of football. From "His Big Moment" the searcher after strange truths may learn: (1) that the dropkick is used for gaining distance in midfield and may be "a perfect spiral"; (2) that a tackler may dive through the air—"a catapult leap"—and escape unpunished; (3) that a coach is acting in an unprecedented manner when he refrains from going on the field to confer with his charges during the mid-half intermission; and (4) that when time expires immediately following a touchdown no try-at-goal is permitted. C. M. C.

Reporters omitted the name of Mr. Herman Roe's paper in their stories the other day. It is, we know, the Northfield, Minn., News; and Mr. Roe's stationery reads, "Cows, Colleges, Contentment," not a bad motto, as mottoes go.

### The Compleat Slangster

(From King Henry IV)  
Some wine, boy.

Definition—M. L. M.—of a Democrat: One who doesn't care whether your ancestors landed at Plymouth or Ellis Island.

For that League of Nations building B. L. T. suggests Chapeau d'Espagne; and J. R. P. thinks Borah Hall wouldn't be bad.

Probably it will be built of stucco and be known as The House of Seven Babels. F. P. A.

# The Wilson-Cox League

How Its Coercion of Nations Violates Teachings of American History

By Theodore Stanfield

The Wilson-Cox league proposes that the body called the council may coerce member states, by force of arms if necessary, notwithstanding the fact history cries out that every such attempt has failed and caused war.

The men who framed the Constitution of the United States discussed, debated and discarded this very principle of coercion of states. It was embodied in the Virginia plan. In his record of the debates of the convention James Madison quotes himself as having said concerning the Virginia plan on June 19, 1787:

"The coercion on which the efficacy of the plan depends can never be exerted but on themselves (referring to the states). The larger states will be impregnable, the smaller only can feel the vengeance of it. He illustrated the position by the history of the Amphictyonic Confederates and the ban of the German Empire. It was the cobweb which could entangle the weak but would be the sport of the strong.

Again, on July 14, 1787, he stated: "The practicability of making laws, with coercive sanction, for the states as political bodies has been exploded on all hands."

## Cannot Coerce States

Alexander Hamilton said: "To coerce the states would be one of the maddest projects ever devised. No state would ever suffer itself to be used as an instrument of coercion another. . . . There could be no cure for this great evil but to enable the national laws to operate on individuals, like the laws of the states."

### Again:

The fundamental principle of the old confederation is defective; we must totally eradicate and discard this principle (coercion of states) before we can expect an efficient government. The gentlemen who have spoken to-day have taken upon the subject of the ancient confederates, but their view of them has been extremely partial and erroneous. The fact is that the name and the principle of the confederation were false and impracticable principle ran through the ancient governments. The first of these governments we read of was the Amphictyonic confederation. The council which managed the affairs of this league possessed powers of a similar complexion to those of our present Congress. The feeble mode of legislation in the hands and under the mask of an ally to one, invaded the liberties of each and finally subverted the whole.

In The Federalist, written by Alexander Hamilton, James Madison and John Jay, the principle of coercion of states is fully treated. The history of its inevitable failure in the past, its failure in their own experience in the confederation of the United States, and its necessary and inevitable failure in the future are expounded in decisive fashion.

## The American Principle

Alexander Hamilton, in one article, stated and proved that "the great and radical vice in the construction of the confederation is in the principle of legislation for states or governments in their corporate or collective capacities as distinguished from the individuals of which they exist."

Whoever considers the opulence and strength of several of these states, single at the present time, and looks forward to what they will be in the future at the distance of half a century, will at once dismiss as idle and visionary any scheme which aims at regulating their movements by laws to operate upon them in their collective capacities, and to be executed by a coercion applicable to them in the same capacities.

Even in those confederacies which have been composed of members smaller than many of our counties, the principle of legislation for sovereign states, supported by military coercion, has never been found to be effective. It has rarely been attempted to be employed but against the member states; and in most instances attempts to coerce the refractory and disobedient have been the signals of bloody wars, in which one half of the confederacy has displayed its banners against the other half.

In brief, the old reactionary principle is that of the coercion by a collection of states of any disobedient state, while the progressive American principle is that of coercion not of states but of individuals. The one disregards the traditions, laws and experience of history, and that of our own great and successful country in particular; the other would take such steps forward as will not prevent in the future a federation of the peoples of the entire world.

It is obvious that coercion of states by other states, in the light of our own national experience and that of the previous attempts of history, proves that such coercion results only in failure. Powerful states in such unions have used coercion against the weak states, but the protection of the weak has not been insured because of the indifference of the strong. The recent Polish incident is an illustration of this fact.

## Economic Pressure

The application of economic pressure would also be unjust and ineffective. Russia has been under economic pressure for several years, yet, being economically independent her military power, though impaired, is still of sufficient strength to threaten the safety of Europe, and it required herculean efforts on the part of heroic Poland to defend herself. Attempted economic coercion exerted against the British Empire would be futile, as it is economically independent. Such coercion against the United States would only serve to strengthen our conviction in the cause which we were sustaining. Dependence upon economic pressure against economically independent states is obviously ineffective and would inflict punishment upon the innocent states as well as offending states. Economic pressure upon small states, on the other hand, would place in the hands of strong states a weapon of autocratic coercion which would surely work contrary to the principles of justice.

There remains the principle of securing world peace by a government of laws instead of a world government by

coercion. Arbitration has not sufficed. Charles Seignobos, the eminent French authority, in The New Europe, November 14, 1918, wrote: "But arbitration, far from being a rough sketch of justice, is the negation of justice between nations. It presupposes that all differences can be adjusted within the framework of a lawsuit and that the parties at variance stand upon the same level morally. It declares in advance that it is powerless to redress any violation of the law, since it does not even admit that the state can be considered guilty of a crime, and hence it places the criminal and the victim upon the same level. . . . To discuss with the brigand the amount of the ransom which he is to exact is not enlarging the domain of justice; it is giving a fresh sanction to brigandage."

The world court proposed by Mr. Harding is to operate upon basic principles of law and justice. International laws of justice, universally accepted, respected and cherished by mankind, will serve as a world code to govern the decisions of the judges.

Upon what means can such a court rely to enforce its decisions? What evidence does our own history offer that sovereign bodies can be depended upon to settle their differences amicably in accordance with a court which bases its decisions upon justice but has no coercive power over the sovereign bodies to enforce its decisions?

## The Harding Plan

Oliver Ellsworth, one of the framers of the Constitution and, subsequently Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, expressed himself in the convention of Connecticut for the ratification of the Constitution as follows:

"Hence we see how necessary for the Union is a coercive principle. No man pretends the contrary; we all see and feel this necessity. The only question is, Shall it be a coercion of law or a coercion of arms? There is no other possible alternative. Where will those who oppose a coercion of law come out? Where will they end? A necessary consequence of their principles is a war of the states on against the other. I am for coercion by law—that coercion which acts only upon individuals. This Constitution does not attempt to coerce sovereign bodies, states, or nations. It is a coercion of law, and in their political capacity. No coercion is applicable to such bodies but that of an armed force. If we should attempt to execute the laws of the Union by sending an armed force against a delinquent state, it would involve the good and bad, the innocent and guilty in the same calamity. But this legal coercion singles out the guilty individual, and punishes him for breaking the laws of the Union. All men will see the reasonableness of this; they will acquiesce, and say, Let the guilty suffer."

A World Supreme Court  
The Constitution explicitly recognized the sovereignty of our states. It provided for a Supreme Court which could interpret the national laws and render decisions against individuals and enforce them by means of statutes which provided for the punishment of individuals. But it has no power over the states as sovereign bodies. In 1861 individuals resisted the national government; strictly no state as such did so.

Yet thirty-one states have been heard as plaintiffs or defendants before this court. Eighty-four decisions involving states have been made and every decision has been complied with, although the Supreme Court and the states explicitly recognized that the court had no power whatever to enforce its decisions. The obedience to these decisions resulted from the recognition of its impartial justice, the respect for the fairness of its justices, its codified procedure and its adherence to a recognized code of laws. A Supreme Court of the world, as proposed by Mr. Harding, operating in accordance with a recognized code of international laws and in adherence to a suitable system of procedure, having, because of its character and organization, the respect of the peoples of the world, can discharge just as effectively as our Supreme Court the duty of settling differences between sovereign bodies without impairing their sovereignty.

## The Long Arm of Justice